

T/V/M-6
2 February 1965

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE BOARD
COMMITTEE ON DOCUMENTATION

Task Team V - Biographics

Minutes of the Sixth Meeting - 25 January 1965

Members or their Representatives Present

25X1A CIA - Mr. [REDACTED] man
- Mr. [REDACTED]
DIA - Mr. [REDACTED]
STATE - Mr. Mitchell Stanley
NAVY - Mr. Marvin E. Van Dera
ARMY - Mr. Paul Anderson
25X1A NSA - Mr. [REDACTED]
- Mr. [REDACTED]
AIR FORCE - Lt. Col. Edmund M. Manning
I&NS - Mr. John L. Keefe
FBI - Mr. Earl W. McCoy
SS - Mr. Frank S. Stoner
CSC - Mr. Pearley G. Buck

1. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.
2. The Chairman advised the Team that the Terms of Reference, as submitted by the Team to CODIB at its last meeting, were approved with two minor additions. One was the addition of paragraph B 2 j "Other facts bearing on system effectiveness or manpower involved in finding biographic information". The second was to add the phrase "and recommend follow on action" at the end of the last sentence of the Recommendations paragraph. Each member was given a copy.
3. The Chairman cited an excellent article on computers which he thought to be of interest to the group, in the December 1964 issue of "Computers and Automation".

Group I
Excluded from automatic
Downgrading and
Declassification.

-2-

4. The Team next considered the cost and manpower information questionnaire that was part of the last minutes. The Secretary has constructed a chart indicating which of the agencies have responded to these questions and indicated to the group which agencies had not. It was agreed that only the following would be required: the total number (items 1-6) under question 1; question 2 as it stands; 1 combined answer for questions 3 & 4; 1 combined answer for questions 5 & 6. This means that there will be two questions to be answered under personnel, one each under machines, supplies, space and cost projection, making a total of six answers. The Team members indicated that they would provide these answers to the Secretary in time for a consolidated report to be prepared by the Secretary by the next meeting.

5. The Team considered and agreed on definitions listed in attachment A to the last minutes. A current corrected copy of the biographic index facts sheet was passed to the members by the Secretary. Discussion was held on the meaning of the "average number of name searches per request" and it was agreed that the procedures followed by most agencies of checking five or ten cards on each side of an individual name being searched would not be considered part of this item. Additionally, the notation of the FBI number concerning six-way name variation check was deleted and a re-estimate was provided by the FBI members for this element. A few additional minor corrections were made by the members to the biographic index facts sheet on the spot. The NSA member requested that the last sentence of paragraph 11 of the definitions be deleted as irrelevant. The group then agreed that the next step would be for some interpretations and observations to be prepared based on these facts. The Chairman indicated that such a paper would be prepared for the Team's consideration in the near future.

6. The Team was provided a blank chart by the Secretary entitled "Interagency Name Checks, Volume -- Time". Consideration was first given to the volume figures. The Secretary pointed out that what was meant here was the average number of requests made daily by each requesting agency to each of the other agencies. Several of the agencies have already provided these figures. It was agreed that the remainder of the members would provide the Secretary with these figures in time for the Secretary to provide a consolidated report sheet to the members by the next meeting. Considerable discussion then ensued concerning how the Team should handle reporting of the time element. Two general approaches were contemplated. One would be to have each agency report how long it takes each other agency to provide a response to the normal request, excluding of course those unusual cases which, for some reason, take an extremely long time. The other approach would be to have each member report how long it takes his agency to respond to a request from other agencies on the average for the normal cases. (It was suggested that the "normal" in both of these cases should include 80% or so of the

requests being handled.) These considerations highlighted the role of the on-site liaison officers and the question was raised as to how to figure the response time under the approaches described above. Should it be from the time the liaison officer gave the request and received the answer, or when the request was sent and response received by the home agency of the liaison officer? The next point considered was whether the time should be calculated at the index level or at some other point in the processing? The question of what is indeed a reply was discussed. This discussion also included whether telephone calls and special methods or special couriers should be considered in the time figures. It was generally agreed that these special cases were not to be considered part of the figures which the Team is trying to acquire. A member suggested that the Team view the processing in the graphic sense by preparing a flow chart including all the major elements of processing which would include the worst as well as the best cases. Considerable discussion was held concerning how days are counted. Those who provide the service usually count the work days. Those receiving the service usually count in calendar days. Another suggestion was for the Team to provide a CODIB-approved sample form to accompany a test group of requests.

7. From all of these suggestions it became clear that the Team members needed more time to reflect on the best way of developing these facts about response times. Therefore, the Chairman suggested that the members consider this problem, attempt to obtain an informal sampling within their own offices from their operating people as to how long, in general, it takes them to get answers from other agencies and also determine how feasible it might be to estimate the number of days that each member's agency takes to provide an "average response" (recognizing that the word average must yet be agreed upon by the Team).

8. The Chairman next pointed out that an appropriate questionnaire on name rules has not yet been prepared for the member's consideration, but that such a questionnaire would be provided the members in the near future.

9. The Secretary requested each of the members to provide him, by the next meeting, with an estimate of the time they or others on their behalf had spent on Team matters from October through December 1964. This has been requested by CODIB.

10. The Chairman announced a firm date for the proposed symposium to be 22 and 23 April 1965, at which time the members plan to go to a site near Washington for a two-day conference on Bio-graphics. The Chairman suggested that the members come to the next meeting prepared to make suggestions as to what subjects they might like to cover, such as various methods of random access in computer

-4-

systems, data preparation problems, name elements, name variants, etc. The Chairman also reminded the members that attendance at this symposium could be expanded to include appropriate additional individuals as desired;

11. It was agreed to request Lt. Gottsman, US Navy, to brief the group on the name file of Chicago Title and Trust and the Mormon church at the next team meeting to take place 11 February 1965 at 0930 hours at CIA Headquarters. A date was also settled on for the group to visit the National Driver's Registration Service at 1717 H St. N.W., Rm. 867 in Washington on 25 February 1965 at 0930 hours. Both of these have been confirmed.

[REDACTED]

Secretary

25X1A